



CONVENTION ON MIGRATORY SPECIES

Distr: General

UNEP/CMS/AERAP-IGM1/4
25 September 2007

Original: English

MEETING TO IDENTIFY AND ELABORATE AN
OPTION FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION
ON AFRICAN-EURASIAN MIGRATORY RAPTORS
UNDER THE CONVENTION ON MIGRATORY SPECIES
Loch Lomond, Scotland, United Kingdom, 22-25 October 2007
Agenda Item 5.0

BACKGROUND ON CMS RAPTOR INITIATIVE AND MEETING OBJECTIVES

1. This paper gives an overview of events leading up to the First Intergovernmental Meeting on Migratory Raptors and sets out the meeting objectives.

December 2002

2. Three British organisations: Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH), the British Ornithologists' Union (BOU) and the Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) - hosted a major national conference on birds of prey at Tulliallan Castle near Stirling, Scotland.

3. A paper entitled "[The Status and Legislative Protection of Birds of Prey and their Habitats in Europe](#)" was given at the conference and made reference to the Convention on Migratory Species and the creation of a new agreement as a possible vehicle for tackling the threats faced by African and Eurasian raptors.

May 2003

4. A draft Resolution was submitted to the VI World Working Group on Birds of Prey and Owls (WWGBP). This urged CMS to consider establishing a multi-lateral agreement on the conservation of African-Eurasian migratory raptors and for range states in the African-Eurasian geographic area actively to work together to establish, ratify and implement such an agreement as a matter of urgency. On 23 May 2003, [the Resolution \(No. 3\)](#) was unanimously adopted.

April 2004

5. The UK Government gave a presentation in April 2004 to the CMS Scientific Council which invited it to support a proposal for the merits of a new CMS agreement on raptors to be explored. The Council recommended that the issue be brought to the next COP, following a UK-funded scoping study.

December 2004

6. The UK Government engaged NatureBureau, a firm of consultants based in the UK, to examine whether or not there was a need for a CMS agreement and if there was, whether it would make a difference, and also whether there was an appetite for such an agreement.

7. [NatureBureau found](#) that more than 50% of species in the proposed agreement area had a poor conservation status and that there was both an appetite for a CMS agreement and that one would make a difference to the plight of the species.

November 2005

8. The UK Government presented the findings of the NatureBureau study to the 8th CMS Conference of the Parties (COP8) in Nairobi, Kenya in November 2005. This underpinned Conference [Recommendation 8.12](#) and Resolution 8.5, which were adopted at the Conference.

February 2006

9. UK Government approached CMS Secretariat for advice on how best to implement Conference Recommendation 8.12 and Resolution 8.5.

April 2006

10. UK Government established a Steering Committee to help prepare for the first inter-governmental meeting to elaborate a possible new CMS instrument for migratory raptors.

May 2006

11. First Steering Committee meeting.

July 2006

12. Range State governments were approached for information about their raptor conservation activities and for contact details of their officials responsible for raptor conservation.

September 2006

13. [A webpage was created](#) on the CMS website and a leaflet was published in [English](#), [French](#) and [Russian](#) to help promote the initiative.

December 2006

14. United Arab Emirates agreed to serve as the partner country in the raptor initiative.

February 2007

15. Scotland offered to host the first Inter-Governmental meeting to elaborate a CMS instrument for migratory raptors.

March 2007

16. Invitations issued to delegates to attend Inter-Governmental meeting.

May 2007

17. United Arab Emirates arranged for the leaflet to be published in [Arabic](#).

June-October 2007

18. Arrangements for Inter-Governmental meeting advanced and finalised.

October 2007

19. First Inter-Governmental Meeting opens with the following objectives:
- i. Agree the CMS instrument type and develop its contents
 - ii. Agree the geographic boundary of instrument
 - iii. Agree the species to be covered
 - iv. Develop the contents of the action plan
 - v. Consider options for institutional bodies and financing considerations
 - vi. Agree next steps to take forward the development of the CMS instrument.